



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

scientific character and to its practicability. As the author has considered and reconsidered his system with several scholars before publishing it, and as his transliteration, according to his own words, "is given as a sort of compromise and concession both to the radical and the conservative side of the question," I have no doubt that it will find ample endorsement. There is, according to my opinion, every prospect of its being accepted at least by the majority of Avestan and Aryan scholars as the basis for a uniform transcription of the Avestan alphabet.

HERMANN COLLITZ.

Die Griechischen Dialekte in ihrem historischen Zusammenhange mit den wichtigsten ihrer Quellen dargestellt von Dr. OTTO HOFFMANN.
I Band, der Süd-Achaïsche Dialekt. Göttingen, 1891.

Following the author's essay on the inscriptions of Dodona (1890), this volume brings together the inscriptions of the South-Achaïan dialect. The second volume will treat of the North-Achaïan (Thessalian). Hoffmann insists on this name as being more comprehensive and withal less confusing than Aeolic. In view of inscriptions already published, much of the matter here given seems unnecessary repetition of what has been well edited before. The inscriptions of lower Italy are excluded, as they belong to the 'Dorian' group, and the Homeric dialect is excluded altogether. In respect of the lyric writers, Hoffmann believes, with Ahrens, in making tradition conform to inscription. The Achaïan elements of the Doric dialects of the Peloponnesus and the southern islands are added as a third division of the group discussed in this volume (Arcadian and Cyprian being the first two divisions), elements which it is obviously impossible to determine until the characteristics of 'South-Achaïan' are established. With occasional critique of Deecke's and Meister's interpretation of well-known inscriptions, a brief *formen-lehre* and syntax, the author gives, then, as new nothing save the arrangement of inscriptions and an attempt to re-establish general divisions among the Greek dialects. To employ Doric, Ionic and Aeolic (Achaïan) as real distinctions will, however, seem to most of Hoffmann's readers a backward step. For convenience it is well enough to speak of the Doric dialect, understanding thereby whatever dialect employs certain strongly-marked forms, used only in certain localities. But for scientific purposes such general distinctions are worse than useless. Every dialectic form must have its local lines of demarcation presented; but when this is done there is an end of geographical distinctions based on such vague terms as Doric and Aeolic.

Hoffmann's answer to Meister's rather expressive remarks on the former's review of the second volume of the Greek Dialects ('Zum Eleischen Arkadischen Kyprischen Dialekte,' 1890) takes up only one point touched upon by Meister. The latter accuses Hall of publishing inaccurate photographs of the inscriptions in the Cesnola collection (American Oriental Society, Vol. X). Hoffmann now asserts that Hall's photographs are absolutely correct, and that Meister has misrepresented the condition of

the Berlin copies of the inscriptions : " Es trifft Meister also der Vorwurf dass er auf Grund einer ungenauer und fehlerhaften Collation der Berliner Abgüsse nicht nur die Richtigkeit der Photographieen und Abschriften Hall's, welche auf den Originalen beruhen, mit unrecht in Zweifel gezogen, sondern auch gegen solche die sich auf Hall verliessen in heftiger, fast beleidigender Weise Anklage erhoben hat."

As Hoffmann, in 1889 felt himself obliged for truth's sake to review Meister's second volume so sharply that the latter in the following year was compelled for justice's sake to reply in such a manner " as to make a peaceful discussion of the matter impossible," it is to be hoped that Dr. Hall will allow the " fast beleidigende Weise " to pass without notice, and rest content with Hoffmann's confirmation of the correctness of his inscriptions, untouched by the odium philologicum which seems to be the moving cause of much of our scientific activity.

Specimens of the author's critique will be found in the discussion on the long Edalion inscription (bronze), and (from Hall's collection) that of Golgoi. In the latter, instead of *καρστι Φάναξ* and *εἰπω* (Deecke and Meister), Hoffmann reads *χαίρετε, γράσθι Φάναξ* . . . *Φείσης* (*γράφω*, Hsych. *γράφε*), taking *Φείσης* as subj. aor. *Φει*=Sk. *φι*, desire. Opposed to Meister is Hoffmann in not admitting *πέμπτε* (§§137, 139) as Cyprian; *σις* (Thess. *κις*), H. says, should not be regarded as the result of an intermediate *τις* (§§109, 136, palatal *τ* is never equated with a dental, and initial assibilation does not occur even before this), but as *qis*=Latin *quis*, " *q* being still extant in North and South Achaian "; so *εμι* (Meister, *ήμι*) for *εμμί* (*σμι* to *μμ*, *μ*, without lengthening the vowel). Meister's suggestion that Cyprian inscriptions ceased with the introduction of the Ptolemaic alphabet is rejected by Hoffmann, whose objection that loss of political independence does not warrant the assumption that the native alphabet was entirely suppressed seems well taken.

Of formal and syntactical matter we note the following : *οὔνει* is given as locative on p. 303; on p. 104 the suggestion is made that it is imperative. Fick's notion that *άν* is from the dialect of the Ionian Kynurians is adopted by Hoffmann, who, therefore, excludes it from the South Achaian except as a borrowed word. Except in *εἰ κ' άν, κε* is found only once after *εἰ*, while *άν* is found after *εἰ, μέστ', ὅτι* and other relatives (Arcadian Cyprian). In Dodona, Astypalaia and Cyprus alone is *ή*=*εἰ*. *κατ*=*και* (Meister, *κά τε*). Noteworthy is the genitive in *πλὸς ἀμέρας* (*ή* also occurs), and in *τῶν συνῶν δαρχμῶν Φεκᾶσταν* (*paid*) 'for each'; of the dative in *ὁ μοι πόσις* and *ἀπ' ὧι Φοι τῶς εὐχλωᾶς ἐπέτωχε*, 'whence he got for himself'; of the locative dative with *ἀπν, ἐξ, ἐπί, ἰν, περί, πός, σύν, ὕ*; and of the accusative or locative with *ἰν* after verbs of placing, laying, etc. After *δέατοι* ('seems') the accusative is used. To the illinguistic mind the statement that there is no dative in Arcadian, e. g. *ὁφλέν τινι τι, Ἀπόλλωνι (ἐδωκαν)*, may seem confusing; but these are datives only to the classical scholar. The tenses offer nothing of special interest. *πείσει*, future, is interpreted as imperative, while the future with *κε* is a 'promise.' The reviewer thinks the examples contain only subjunctive aorists. The subjunctive *ης, η* Hoffmann regards as injunctive, and consequently claims this form as still extant (p. 260), in Greece as in India.

The optative is used only in Arcadian after the conditional εi ; in principal clauses only in Cyprian. Subject-infinitives are common to both dialects, but object-infinitives are found only in Cyprian. The $\dot{\upsilon}=\varepsilon\dot{\upsilon}$ (only Cyprian) H. with Fick connects with English up, not with Sk. *ud* (Baunack), nor with *ava*, *avi* ($\acute{\alpha}\varphi\iota=\varepsilon\pi\acute{\iota}$, $\dot{\epsilon}\nu$; $\alpha\iota\pi\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$, compare $\varepsilon\phi\eta\beta\omicron\varsigma$, $\acute{\alpha}\dot{\iota}\delta\eta\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ and $\alpha\dot{\iota}\zeta\eta\omicron\varsigma$).

Perhaps the most surprising fact gleaned from an examination of the syntax of these semi-barbarous Greeks is that they spoke Greek so 'correctly.' Many of the variations from the norm generally accepted seem to be due to ignorance, not to an inherited difference, and may therefore be justly looked upon as errors alone, such errors as one finds upon New England gravestones, possessing rather a psychological than an historical value.

— — — E. W. HOPKINS.

Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache von FRIEDRICH KLUGE.
5te verbesserte Auflage. I. Lieferung. Strassburg, 1891.

The first part of the fifth edition of Kluge's Dictionary reaches from 'A' to 'burschikos,' and has been enlarged from 47 pages in the fourth edition to sixty pages. A vast number of articles have been wholly or in part rewritten, and more than 130 new entries made. Of new articles, mostly with careful dates and copious references to New High German literature, we note Abbild, Abele, abonnieren, abschätzig, absolvieren, Abstecher, Abstimmung, Accent, Adamsapfel, an article of 41 lines; addieren, ade and adieu, Adjutant, Admiral, Adresse, Advocat, Affect, Agio, Agraffe, ähneln, Akt, Akten and Aktie, alert, Alkohol, alle sein, Allée, Aloe, Alt=alto, Altan, altfränkisch, Altweibersommer, to which 26 lines are devoted; amarant, Amethyst, Amnestie, amüsieren, Ananas, Anchovi, Anke¹, antik, Antipathie, Aeonen, Apanage, apart, Apfelsine, Apotheke, Appetit, à propos, Archiv, Arie, Arithmetik, Arkade, Armee, aromatisch, Arras, Arrest, Arsenal, Arsenik, Artillerie, Artischoke, Ather, Atlas, 1 and 2; Atout, Attentat, Audienz, Auktion, Autor. Baggage, Bagatelle, Bajonett, Ballade, Ballet, Ballon, Bambus, banal, Banane, Bandit, Bänkelsänger, Bankerott, Baracke, Barriere, Barrikade, Basalt, Bassin, basta, Bataillon, Batterie, beiern, belfern, Belletrist, benedeien, Bergamotbirne, Bëst, Bibliothek, biderb, Bigamie, Bilanz, Billard, Billet, Biskuit, Bitze, Bivouak, bizarr, blamieren, Blankett, Blaustrumpf, Blockieren, blümerant, Bö, Bockshorn, Bombe, Bonbon, Bon-mot, Böschung, Bouquet, boycotten, Brigade, brillant, Bronze, brünnett, Büchel, Buchstabe and buchstabieren, Buchweizen, with very interesting historical remarks, Buhne, Bureau, Bürger and burschikos.

Special attention has been paid to the historic development of meanings. It is a pleasure to see the great many exact dates to the literature of the sixteenth and seventeenth century, which constituted a great desideratum in the preceding editions. The following words are the most noteworthy in this connection: Aalraupe, Aar, which has been enlarged from 9 lines to 52; Aberglaupe, Adebar, Adler, ähnlich, albern, Alkoven, Alp, Alpe, Ameise, Amsel, Arbeit, Assel, Auster, which has now 26 lines instead of 5; Ballast, Bankert, Bass, Bauten, Bazar, Beifuss, Beissker, Bellhammel, Bemme, Bernstein, bieder, Bill, blach, blass and Blässe, blond, Bock and Bocksbeutel, Böhnhase, Boot, brav, Bucht, Buhle, Bühne and bummeln.

Many native compounds and dialect words are taken up in the body of the